

Administrative Determination
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management
Anchorage Field Office

A. Describe the Proposed Action

Austin Arms and Exploration

Jerry Austin, Austin Arms and Exploration, lives in St. Michael, Alaska, and plans to conduct ten-day spring or fall hunts for grizzly bear and moose. All operations will be within guide-outfitter areas 18, 21E, and 22A. He has not indicated any specific hunting locations or spike camps on BLM lands. This is because he uses temporary mobile tent camps when pursuing game. Operations usually extend from his private cabin at the mouth of the Golsovia River and other private land. He has obtained concurrence from the other private land owners (Native Corporations). He requests this permit so he is not restricted from the BLM lands he may occasionally cross or hunt within guide-outfitter areas 18, 21E, and 22A.

His guiding activities will extend from April 10th to May 25th each year for spring bear, and all of August, September, and October, for fall bear and moose hunting. He plans on a maximum of two clients during the spring and seven during the fall. Maximum at any one time will be three. Access to hunting areas will be by boat in most cases, but may also include the use of a fixed wing aircraft (supercub), and snowmobile, if necessary. He estimates that less than five percent of his time will be on BLM land.

This is a renewal of his original 5 year permit issued in 1991. Environmental Assessment AK-040-96-12 was completed in 1996 which extended his permit to 2000. The proposed action has not changed since 1996.

Aniak Air Guides

Rick and Laurie Townsend, Aniak Air Guides, are renewing their 5 year permit. The proposed action has not changed since the last NEPA analysis. They propose to guide two bear and two moose hunters in guide-outfitter area 21E/A and 19A/B. Specifically, hunts will be within the Anvik River drainage above Otter Creek. Bear season takes place both in the spring (May) and in the fall (October). Moose season starts in September.

Base camp for this operation is at their lodge in Aniak. Temporary mobile four-man tent camps will be utilized for this operation. These spike camp locations will vary from year to year, depending upon location of the game. All hunting will be done from spike camps. Access to the camps is by a fixed wing aircraft. Spring hunts may include the use of snowmobiles which they fly-in in their Beaver aircraft. Boats may be used in the fall for floating the river. No fuel will be stored on site. Hunts are generally eight days in duration.

AD (Cont'd.)

Document No.: AK-040-AD01-016

Case File No.: AA-74551 and AA-73713

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Southwest Management Framework Plan Date Approved: 11/81

* Applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Activity objectives Wildlife (WL-4), Recreation (R-3), and Minerals (M-2). These decisions do not directly address special use permitting, but recognize that hunting, fishing, and trapping are legitimate uses of public land.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

EA No.: AK-040-96-12
Case File No.: AA-73713 - Aniak Air Guides
AA-74551 - Austin Arms and Exploration
AA-66915 - Hank Hankard, Ltd.

EA No.: AK-040-EA00-026
Casefile No.: FF-086768 - Vance Grishkowsky
AA082416 - Dick Sjoden

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

See Cultural Clearance and Threatened and Endangered Species determination attached to EA AK-040-96-12.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current Proposed Action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

The proposed action analyzed in EA-AK-040-96-12 is the same proposed action for the same applicants. Thus the use locations, access, duration, and time of year have not changed.

AD (Cont'd.)

Document No.: AK-040-AD01-016

Case File No.: AA-74551 and AA-73713

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes, the environmental values, concerns and interest remain the same as when last analyzed in EA AK-040-96-12. We are not aware of any changes that would alter or change our Decision Record or range of alternative considered.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?**

No new information has been presented that would change the Decision Record.

- 4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action?**

Environmental Assessment AK-040-96-12 and AK-040-EA00-026 are comprehensive EA's in-line with the current standards and procedures used today for completing NEPA documents.

- 5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?**

No direct, indirect or site specific impacts were identified in either EA-AK-040-96-12 or AK-040-EA00-026. This will remain true for the current proposed action.

- 6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

No cumulative impacts were identified in either EA-AK-040-96-12 or AK-040-EA00-026. No Cumulative impacts are expected with the continuation of the current proposed actions.

- 7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?**

Yes. State and Native land managers have been made aware of the current proposed action and have submitted their concurrence.

AD (Cont'd.)

Document No.: AK-040-AD01-016

Case File No.: AA-74551 and AA-73713

- E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

 Name

 Title

See attached NEPA routing sheet.

- F. Conclusion**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

 /s/ Peter Ditton, Acting
Anchorage Field Manager

 May 10, 2001
Date